

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claim 9 has been canceled. Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are pending, of which claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 13-14, 16-18, and 20 have been  
5 amended.

The amendments to independent claims 1, 13, and 16 do not necessitate a new search. For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite a "restricted Web site being accessed by a program module in the printing device", which is similar in feature to original independent claim 7 which recites "a printing  
10 device comprising a restricted Web browser configured to access a restricted Web site". See also Fig. 3.

Further, Applicant's amendments and remarks after Final are appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because they address the Office's remarks in the Final Action, and thus could not have been presented earlier. In addition,  
15 the amendments and remarks should be entered to place the case in better form for appeal.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form  
20 (*Office Action* p.8). Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability.

Independent claim 7 is amended to include the allowable feature(s) of claim 9 (now canceled). Accordingly, claim 7 along with dependent claims 8 and 10-12 are in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

25

**35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 6,798,997 to Hayward et al. (hereinafter, "Hayward"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,867 to Lee (hereinafter, "Lee")  
5 (*Office Action* p.2). Claims 7-8 and 10-12 are in condition for allowance as described above. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-6 and 13-20.

Claim 1 recites a method comprising:

10

detecting within a printing device when a new replaceable component is installed into the printing device;

15

determining within the printing device if the new replaceable component is of a particular brand; and

20

establishing a communication link from the printing device to a restricted Web site that is restricted to devices that include products having the particular brand if the new replaceable component is determined to be of the particular brand, the restricted Web site being accessed by a program module in the printing device.

Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest establishing a  
25 communication link from the printing device to a restricted Web site where the restricted Web site is accessed by a program module in the printing device, as recited in claim 1.

Hayward describes that an application program running in a computer receives a peripheral condition (e.g., such as from a printer), and the  
30 application launches a browser in the computer to access a manufacturer or vendor server (*Hayward* col.5, lines 15-17; col.6, lines 34-42; col.7, lines 60-63). Hayward only describes that a computer includes a browser to access a server. Hayward does not provide any indication that a program module is

implemented in a printing device to access a restricted Web site, as recited in claim 1.

The Office cites Hayward for a browser that is launched when indicia of a component in a printer is determined to be of a particular brand (*Office Action* p.3; *Hayward* col.7, lines 60-63). As described above, Hayward only describes  
5 that a computer includes the browser cited by the Office.

Further, Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest “establishing a communication link from the printing device to a restricted Web site”, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Hayward describes providing access to an on-line order screen or Web page for ordering consumable supplies (*Hayward* col.1  
10 lines 48-49; col.7 lines 60-63). There is no indication in Hayward, however, that a Web page or vendor server is restricted to devices that include products associated with a particular brand, or that a communication link to a restricted Web page is from a printing device, as recited in claim 1.

Lee is directed to methods by which a replaceable component and a  
15 printer containing the component communicate, and is only cited by the Office for detecting when a new replaceable component is installed into a printing device (*Office Action* p.3). There is no discussion in Lee of a restricted Web site or of a program module in the printing device to access the restricted Web  
20 site, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-6 are allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

25 Claim 13 recites “...the printing device including a program module configured to access the restricted Web site when the printing device determines that the replaceable component is of the particular brand.”

As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest that a printing device includes a program module to access a restricted Web site, or that a restricted Web site is accessed when the printing device determines that a replaceable component has a particular brand, as recited in claim 13.

Hayward and/or Lee also do not teach or suggest "a brand identifier which is verified by a printing device in which the replaceable component is installed to determine whether the replaceable component is of a particular brand", as recited in claim 13.

The Office recognizes that Hayward does not disclose that a printing device verifies a brand identifier of a replaceable component installed in a printing device (*Office Action* p.6). Thus, the Office cites Lee for a sensor that detects whether a new part is installed in a printer (*Office Action* pp.6-7; *Lee* col.3, lines 61-65). Applicant agrees that Lee only describes detecting whether a new part is installed in a printer. However, there is no indication in Lee of both detecting that a new part is installed and then verifying a brand identifier of a replaceable component (e.g., the new part) installed in the printing device, as recited in claim 13.

Accordingly, claim 13 along with dependent claims 14-15 are allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 16 recites computer executable instructions that direct a printing device to "identify a brand of a replaceable component installed in the printing device", and "establish access to a restricted Web site..., the restricted Web site being accessed by a program module in the printing device."

As described above in response to the rejection of claim 13, Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest a printing device to identify a brand associated with a replaceable component installed in the printing device, as recited in claim 16.

5 Further, as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest a restricted Web site being accessed by a program module in the printing device, as recited in claim 16.

Accordingly, claim 16 along with dependent claims 17-20 are allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for at least the reasons described above and

10 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

Pending claims 1-8 and 10-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If  
15 any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

20

Dated: DEC 19, 2005

By: 

David A. Morasch  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 42,905  
(509) 324-9256 x 210